



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

on the very dates when the disturbed sections were in process of being brought into view by rotation. Perhaps the most striking illustration of the whole matter in a single instance is to be found in the history of a great disturbance upon the sun in January, 1886. Upon the 12th of that month spots suddenly began to form almost precisely at the meridian and about 10° south of the sun's equator. Upon the four days following, these spots became numerous, and some of them very large, covering an enormous area, extending finally from the meridian almost half-way to the western limb. It would seem that if magnetic effects ever proceeded from the sun's meridian that this, above every other, should have been a case in point. But there was scarcely any disturbance whatever and no auroras were reported from any source. On Jan. 16 and 17 the magnets were entirely free from disturbance when this great spot-group was undergoing many rapid changes and was generally in the precise location to have a terrestrial magnetic effect according to the idea which Professor Ricco attempted to work out as above described. When, however, this area was at the eastern limb, from Jan. 7 to 11, although it had not yet developed spots and was the seat of groups of brilliant faculæ only, there was an entirely different state of affairs, a great magnetic storm being in progress and auroras being reported generally from localities in high latitudes. Thus it appears that it is not faculæ in general that produce such marked effects, but faculæ in the location of areas frequented more or less persistently by spots, etc.

M. A. VEEDER.

Lyons, N.Y., April 14.

Where is the Litre?

I HAVE read Professor Mendenhall's contribution to *Science* of April 21 with surprise. I did not think it possible for so eminent a man to so entirely miss the point of any article he might condescend to read and criticise. Nor did I think it possible for so keen-witted a controversialist to so entirely forget his own argument as to admit and corroborate the very statements he set out to refute. Yet any reader of *Science* who may take the trouble to read the two articles written respectively by Professor Mendenhall and myself under the heading "Where is the Litre?" will see that both of the unlikely events in question have happened.

I invite my distinguished critic to re-peruse the paper he attacks, and to thus ascertain whether it contains any statements or contentions displaying "ignorance of the recognized principles of metrology," or whether it sets forth "certain conclusions which will generally be harmless on account of the very magnitude of their errors." If he can find any statements, contentions, or conclusions that appear to him to justify such descriptions, let him quote them in their *ipsisima verba*, and let him show in what manner they betray ignorance or error. I will then, in my turn, show the Professor to be mistaken.

This is no over-bold challenge. It is almost self-evident that Professor Mendenhall was unable to find any display of ignorance or any erroneous conclusion in my article; as, in that case, he would naturally have quoted the offending passages in justification of his severe remarks. But his only approach to quotation is worded as follows: "The sermonizing finish to the article, beginning with the sentence, 'In spite of the much lauded simplicity of metric measures,' etc., may, however, mislead a few readers whose ideas have been befogged by the perusal of the previous three pages." Such a reference is too loose, too indefinite, and too general to indicate what particular statements or conclusions are objected to; and the Professor's scornful allusion to easily-befogged readers of *Science* is, perhaps, too donnish.

And now, while leaving my critic to the digestion of my challenge, I may, without impropriety, quote some opinions that have reached me from other authorities.

1. The *Engineering News* of March 30, in an editorial reference to my paper, says: "Different enactments by legislative bodies, errors in measurement and in calculation, difference in weights between bodies weighed in air and weighed in vacuo, and difference in weights between water containing air and water freed from it have conspired to produce these variations. It is true these variations are all so small as not to affect the practical ac-

curacy of any ordinary measurements; but for the exact work of physicists and chemists, and for some of the finer measurements of engineers, these variations are sufficient to affect the results. The moral which Mr. Emmens points is that the author of any paper or treatise claiming scientific accuracy, and dealing in quantities whose exact values may be in doubt, should preface his work with a statement of the constants adopted throughout the work. In a personal letter to us Mr. Emmens makes the further suggestion that the international congress of scientists and engineers at Chicago next summer will afford an excellent opportunity for defining anew the metric standards whose values have become most variable, thus restoring to the system the advantages of simplicity and freedom from ambiguity which it was originally intended to possess. It certainly gives good ground for criticism that in every school in the land pupils are taught that the litre is equal to the cubic decimetre, whereas, in reality, the litre is about 0.1 cubic inches larger than a cubic decimetre, the exact variation depending on what value is chosen for each."

2. Professor De Volson Wood, of the Stevens Institute, writes: "Your article in *Science*, 'Where is the Litre?' is such a model of courteous discussion that I thank you for it. The closing remarks contain sentiments I often advocate, but you have done it so much more completely and in all respects so much better than I could, that I appreciate it."

3. Mr. R. A. Hadfield, of the Hecla Steel Works, Sheffield, England, whose scientific reputation is world-wide, writes: "It appears to me you have touched the weak point of the Metric system, and it was only the other evening, at a lecture on this subject, that I was aware for the first time there was a difference between the litre and the cubic decimetre. No doubt many others are in the same way, and it would therefore be specially desirable to have some common understanding on this matter."

4. Mr. Latimer Clark, F.R.S., writes: "I will see the Board of Trade with your letters. They are as anxious as you or I can be to help in such a cause, and would do anything to promote it. The Chicago conference would afford a capital opportunity for raising the question, and I will do anything required if you will point out what you recommend. The difference between the litre and cubic decimetre is simply one of popular belief and teaching, and it arises from the French Bureau having decided to adopt the bulk of the kilogramme of water as the bulk of the litre. I may perhaps add that the Warden of the Standards here has written me that he acknowledges my dictionary as correctly setting forth the values they have adopted and are employing, and he adds that he recommends the book to all enquirers on the subject."

I refrain from adducing further evidence lest I should put Professor Mendenhall in the position of the dissentient jurymen who complained that "he had never before, in the whole of his life, met with eleven such obstinate fellows."

STEPHEN H. EMMENS.

Youngwood, Pa., April, 25.

Sham Biology in America.

MR. CONWAY MACMILLAN has shown more enthusiasm than discretion in his recent article. He is writing in a good cause, namely, the elevation of botany to an equal rank with zoölogy in biological teaching in universities. Biology, however, is not the science of animals and of plants, as Mr. MacMillan maintains, it is rather the science of life; and I am not aware that biology is taught in any large institution in this country without taking advantage of the fact that certain laws and principles of life are, for purposes of practical study, far better shown in plants than in animals. Plant biology is therefore extensively taught upon the lines laid down by Huxley and Martin, and on such lines we simply select the organism which best demonstrates a certain principle. If the botanists of this country allow the zoölogists to take the lead as *biologists*, that is, in setting forth the fundamental principles of life from their observations upon animals, it will naturally follow that zoölogy will occupy the leading position in the universities. Mr. MacMillan's argument should therefore be directed to the botanists and not to the zoölogists, who are in no